

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 6 and 8 have been canceled, claims 5, 7, 9, 11 and 12 have been amended, and claim 13 has been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 7, and 9-13 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because:

(a) at least certain of the rejected claims have been canceled thereby at least reducing the issues for appeal;

(b) it is believed that the amendments of claims 5, 7, 9, 11 and 12 put this application into condition for allowance;

(c) the amendments were not earlier presented because the Applicants believed in good faith that the cited prior art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed;

(d) the amendments of claims 5, 7, 9, 11 and 12 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised; and/or

(e) the amendments do not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for appeal.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in §714.12 that "[a]ny amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." (Underlining added for emphasis) Moreover, §714.13 sets forth that "[t]he Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action, at pages 2-5, claims 5-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,046,742 (Chari) and USPN 6,219,628 (Kodosky et al.). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 5 and 12 have been amended, pursuant to lines 2-6 and 14-24 of page 12 of the specification, to additionally recite: for each editable attribute of the at least one editable attribute, providing a name portion and a data portion, the name portion being used to identify the editable attribute, the data portion being scrollable horizontally if a graphical representation of the data portion requires more space than a space offered by the display window, the graphical representation of the name portion being stationary; and
arranging the name portion and the data portion in horizontal rows, the horizontal rows being arranged one below another, wherein the position of the name portion is retained during horizontal scrolling.

It is respectfully submitted that, as noted by the Examiner, neither Chari nor Kodosky disclose arranging the name portion and data portion in horizontal rows, the horizontal rows being arranged one below the other. This limitation was described in claims 6 and 8, and has been incorporated into amended independent claims 5 and 12. Claims 6 and 8 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. In addition, a further limitation (see lines 14-24 of page 12 of the specification) has been added to recite that the position of the name portion is retained during horizontal scrolling. Such an arrangement is advantageous because it allows the user to always relate the data which is displayed in a line to the respective variable or structure, respectively, which can be recognized by the designation listing in the name portion since this plain text description is always found at the beginning of the line in the name column portion which is stationary there. It is respectfully submitted that such an arrangement is not taught or suggested by Chari or Kodosky.

Thus, it is submitted that amended independent claims 5 and 12 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over USPN 6,046,742 (Chari) and USPN 6,219,628 (Kodosky et al.). Since claims 7, 9, 10 and 11 depend from amended claim 5, claims 7, 9, 10, and 11 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over USPN 6,046,742 (Chari) and USPN 6,219,628 (Kodosky et al.) for at least the reasons that amended claim 5 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over USPN 6,046,742 (Chari) and USPN 6,219,628 (Kodosky et al.).